presence of the testator. It would seem that the testator's signature is an essential part of the will which they must subscribe and the better rule appears to be that the order of signing is material. American text writers are divided in their opinion as to which view is supported by the weight of authority in this country. See PAGE, WILLS, § 222; 1 REDFIELD, WILLS *226; 1 UNDERHILL, WILLS, § 195; SCHOULER, WILLS, § 328.

WITNESSES—CREDIBILITY MAY BE ATTACKED BY EVIDENCE OF GENERAL REPUTATION FOR MORALITY.—In an action brought by the plaintiff on a claim which he held against the defendant's decedent, the plaintiff took the stand in his own behalf. For the sole purpose of discrediting his testimony, the court allowed the defendant to introduce evidence of the plaintiff's general reputation for morality in the neighborhood in which he lived. The plaintiff objected that his character was not in issue. *Held*, that under § 529 of BURNS' ANN. ST. (1908), the evidence was competent for the purpose for which it was admitted. *Castle* v. *Clark* (1910), — Ind. App. —, 90 N. E. 640.

The credibility of a party to a civil action, who testifies in his own behalf, may be impeached in the same manner as that of any other witness. *Alkire Grocer Co.* v. *Tagart*, 78 Mo. App. 166. In those states in which the situation is not controlled by statute, there is a conflict among the cases as to what sort of reputation evidence is admissible to affect credibility. In many jurisdictions the testimony is limited to such as shows the witness's general reputation for truth and veracity in the community in which he lives. *Gilchrist* v. *M'Kee*, 4 Watts (Pa.) 380; *Rudsdill* v. *Slingerland*, 18 Minn. 380; *Shaw* v. *Emery*, 42 Me. 59; *Atwood* v. *Impson*, 20 N. J. Eq. 150; 3 ENCYC. OF EVID. 22 and cases there cited. WIGMORE calls this the better rule. 3 WIGMORE, EVID. 1060. In about as large a number of jurisdictions a witness may be impeached by evidence of his general moral character. *Sorrelle* v. *Craig*, 9 Ala. 534; *Turner* v. *King*, 98 Ky. 253; *Bakeman* v. *Rose*, 18 Wend. (N. Y.) 146; 3 ENCYC. OF EVID. 23 and cases there cited. An exhaustive review of the cases, involving this question, will be found in a note in 2 WIGMORE, EVID. p. 1061. The latter rule has been adopted by statute in some states; among them Indiana, the state in which the case under discussion was decided. KIRBY DIG. OF ST. OF ARK. (1904), § 3138; POMEROY'S CAL. CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (1901), § 2051; Vol. II Ga. Code, § 5293; Iowa Code (1897), § 4614; BURNS' ANN. CODE (Ind. 1908), § 529; OREGON C. C. P., (1892) § 840; CARROLL'S KY C. C. P. (1900), § 597; MONT. C. C. P. (1895), §§ 3123 and 3379; UTAH COMP. ST. C. C. P. (1907), § 3412; IDAHO REV. ST. (1887), § 5956; N. MEX. COMP. L. (1897), § 3026.